SUMMARY OF THE PUBLIC PROCESS

The public process for the TMP Update has had three major components: a telephone survey on transportation issues, preparation of public outreach materials including an outreach brochure with enclosed questionnaire, and a series of public forums and community meetings. The public process for the TMP Update was designed to reach as many people as possible by utilizing a variety of outreach techniques. One of the goals of the process was to contact people on their own time and turf, and seek input from citizens who might not normally engage in discussions of transportation policy and planning.

In considering the results of the public process, Council should remember the source of each of the results and the knowledge the respondents are likely to have of the TMP Update. In the case of the phone survey, we can safely assume that most respondents do not have specific knowledge of the Update and are responding primarily to the information provided in the survey question. While the sequence of the questions is designed to help the respondent think more deeply about transportation issues, phone surveys tend to primarily measure initial reactions to the questions. However the strength of the phone survey is its scientific validity in providing a representative sample of the community. Techniques for the telephone survey that ensure representation and guard against bias include: random selection of households, random selection of person within household, at least five attempts before dropping a household from the sample, comparison of sample demographics to population demographics and statistical weighting to make the sample more representative, and rotation of response scale order.

In the case of the public outreach brochure, we can generally assume that the respondents have read the brochure and had time to think about the material before filling out the questionnaire. These respondents have had the opportunity to read about the concepts of the TMP Update in much greater detail than the respondents of the phone survey. Finally, the respondents from the public meetings have the opportunity to hear not only the presentation on the Update, but other people's reactions and responses. So this dialogue among the audience is likely to prompt thoughts and reactions in a way different from either the phone survey or the brochure questionnaire.

Given the different levels of knowledge and types of reactions that we are collecting, consistent themes appearing across the sources would likely have a good deal of strength. In the same way, inconsistencies may in part be explained by these differences.

Transportation Phone Survey

The first component of the public process is the transportation telephone survey, designed by the Center for Policy and Program Analysis (CPPA) and administered during the week of March 5. This is a scientifically valid statistical sampling of the Boulder Valley community on issues related to transportation and congestion. A total of 400 households in the Boulder Valley completed the survey. The survey took an average of 23 minutes per respondent to administer. This survey was intended to provide a baseline measure of the public's understanding of transportation issues, the general policy directions, and potential tradeoffs of the TMP. This survey can gauge initial public support for some of the broad concepts in the TMP, but it is most appropriate for identifying areas of concern and targeting educational efforts. Such surveys are not appropriate for directing public policy direction as they lack the ability to explore complex issues and tradeoffs.

Survey Results

In each table, the text of the question asked is included along with the tabulation of the responses.

Unless otherwise noted, all percentages are based on 400 respondents.

.

Transportation Master Plan Update Telephone Survey
Preliminary Results

Table One

In planning for Boulder's transportation system, a number of issues might be considered. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is the least important and 5 is the most important, please rate how important you think each of these are for the City of Boulder's Transportation Planning.	**Average Rating [1=least important, 5=most important]**	**Percent of Respondents Rating as "4" or "5"**
reduction of future traffic congestion	4.19	76.7
improvement in air quality	4.07	73.3
the preservation of community quality	4.07	71.8
reduction of current traffic congestion	4.05	69.8
travel safety	3.96	68.0
maintenance of the existing system	3.86	68.0
expansion of the transit system	3.75	63.3
expansion of the bikeway system	3.74	63.1
expansion of sidewalks and walkway systems	3.44	47.3
reducing the effects of automobile traffic on neighborhoods, such as noise barriers and slowing of through traffic	3.31	44.5
the cost of transportation projects	3.28	40.3
improving the ease of travel by car	3.09	37.7
expansion of the roadway system	2.92	32.8

Table Two

If no action is taken, do you think, traffic congestion will get better or worse in Boulder over the next 20 years? Do you think it will be. .	**Percent of Respondents**
much better	1.5
somewhat better	0.6
remain the same	3.5
somewhat worse	16.0
much worse	78.3
TOTAL	100.0

Table Three	
Projected traffic trends forecast increased traffic in Boulder by the year 2020. If such trends are accurate, do you favor or oppose the community taking action to prevent worsening traffic congestion?	**Percent of Respondents N=393**
strongly favor	55.9
somewhat favor	29.7
neither favor nor oppose	7.7
somewhat oppose	2.7
strongly oppose	4.0
TOTAL	100.0

Table Four	
Do you favor or oppose the continued involvement of the City of Boulder in efforts to prevent worsening traffic congestion? Would you say you†.†.†.	**Percent of Respondents**
strongly favor	57.0
somewhat favor	28.3
neither favor nor oppose	6.3
somewhat oppose	2.7
strongly oppose	5.6
TOTAL	100.0

Table Five		
If it is decided that the City should continue efforts to reduce future traffic congestion, there are a number of strategies which could be pursued to help achieve this goal. I am going to read a list of possible strategies. Please tell me whether you would strongly support, somewhat support, neither support nor oppose, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose such measures.	**Average Rating [1=strongly oppose, 5=strongly support]**	**Percent of Respondents Who "Strongly" or "Somewhat Support"**
increasing small shuttle transit service like the HOP	4.56	92.6
improving traffic flow through measures such as additional left turn lanes and improved traffic signals	4.33	87.2
adopting urban design plans which reduce dependence on automobiles	4.32	85.4
providing an Eco-Pass for all Boulder residents, which allows free use of RTD buses and the HOP	4.29	84.8
increasing transit service through RTD	4.23	84.0
expanding the bike system within Boulder	4.17	81.5
expanding the pedestrian system, such as sidewalks and benches	4.10	75.5
managing the rate of population growth	3.39	57.0
increasing road capacity by widening roads	2.93	42.7
increasing the cost of parking	2.81	39.1
managing the rate of job growth	2.77	36.1
increasing the cost of driving	2.60	34.1
building more roads	2.57	29.2

Table Six	
The City is currently updating the Transportation Master Plan, a document that guides the City in deciding how transportation funding is spent, what transportation projects or programs to focus on, and what the community needs to do to fund and meet transportation goals. **It is anticipated that regardless of the approach taken by the City, there is not enough money to fund projects which would prevent future traffic congestion. Between $400 and $600 per household per year would have to be collected over the next 25 years in order to cover these costs.** **Given these cost projections, do you favor or oppose the City pursuing revenue sources to fund projects to reduce future traffic congestion? Would you . . .**	**Percent of Respondents** $_{N=387}$
strongly favor	26.5
somewhat favor	33.3
neither favor nor oppose	14.1
somewhat oppose	13.1
strongly oppose	13.1
TOTAL	100.0

Table Seven	
If the City moves forward in relieving future traffic congestion, there are several approaches which could be taken in response to traffic congestion. I am going to describe a couple of these, and ask your opinions about the direction the City of Boulder should take. **One approach is to increase road capacity to handle the traffic demand; a second is for citizens to reduce the number of trips they make by driving alone.** **An approach of increasing road capacity means building additional lanes on existing roads, and constructing new roads. Such measures may have a negative impact on neighborhoods and on air quality.** **An approach which emphasizes reduction in drive alone trips would call for further improvement of alternate transportation systems, such as bikeways, sidewalks and a bus system as well as changes in urban design. However, for the approach to be successful, all citizens would have to significantly reduce the number of drive alone trips they make each day.** **On which approach do you think the City should place greater emphasis?**	**Percent of Respondents** $_{N=390}$
reduction in drive alone trips	61.6
increased road capacity	15.2
both	14.4
neither / other	8.8
TOTAL	100.0

Table Eight	
If there were no increase in road capacity, the total number of vehicle miles traveled by driving alone within Boulder would need to remain at current levels to keep congestion from getting worse. **Given other factors which work to increase automobile travel, citizens would need to reduce the number of drive alone trips they make by 50% over the next 25 years. For example, if you currently make 10 trips in a day by driving alone, 5 of these trips would need to be made using another form of transportation, or not made at all.** **Do you favor or oppose the City pursuing such an approach to reduce future traffic congestion? Would you say you . . .**	**Percent of Respondents** $_{N=391}$
strongly favor	32.9
somewhat favor	31.7
neither favor nor oppose	11.3
somewhat oppose	8.7
strongly oppose	15.3
TOTAL	100.0

Table Nine	
Increased funding would be necessary for development of a system with sufficient options to support such behavioral change. It would cost about $400 per household per year over the next 25 years to provide these funds. **Given the need for increased funding, and the significant behavioral change required, do you favor or oppose the City pursuing such an approach to reduce future traffic congestion? Would you say you . . . .**	**Percent of Respondents** $_{N=382}$
strongly favor	21.9
somewhat favor	36.1
neither favor nor oppose	11.4
somewhat oppose	13.1
strongly oppose	17.6
TOTAL	100.0

Table Ten	
Significant change in personal driving habits is necessary in order for such an approach to be successful in reducing future traffic congestion. Given that a wide range of improved options would be available as alternatives to making trips by driving alone, how likely would you be to reduce by half the number of trips you make by driving alone over the next 25 years? Would you say . . .	**Percent of Respondents** $_{N=384}$
very likely	46.0
somewhat likely	32.7
somewhat unlikely	7.9
very unlikely	13.4
TOTAL	100.0

While the initial results of the survey are presented here, staff will continue to analyze data from the survey. The survey included basic demographic questions on age, income and student status, as well as questions on alternative mode use, telecommuting and home work. A variety of cross tabulations will be run to explore the relationships between these factors and the survey responses. In addition, the responses from the open ended questions will be reviewed by staff for themes and for creative ideas on dealing with our transportation issues. The personnel who conducted the survey noted that respondents had a large number of comments.

Public Outreach Brochure

The second component of the public process is the public outreach materials. A "nested" set of materials have been prepared, including the community outreach brochure, the Executive Summary, and the draft TMP Update. These materials allow the public to

consider the Update in complexity and detail. The outreach brochure was distributed to over 30,000 households in Boulder, and included a questionnaire on the community dialogue questions. Over 2,250 of these questionnaires have been returned to the City and their responses tabulated and coded. In addition, TMP materials have been posted on the Boulder Community Network (BCN) and a video of two TMP presentations aired numerous times on Channel 8.

Questionnaire results follow on next page.

Table Eleven	
Do you believe that if no action is taken, traffic congestion will grow better or worse in Boulder over the next 20 years?	**Percent of Respondents** $_{N=2175}$
much better	1.3
somewhat better	0.5
remain the same	4.4
somewhat worse	19.2
much worse	74.7
TOTAL	100.0

Table Twelve	
If the projections showing increased traffic and worsening air quality are accurate, do you support or oppose the community taking action to prevent future transportation problems?	**Percent of Respondents** $_{N=2151}$
strongly support	70.6
somewhat support	18.7
neither favor nor oppose	3.5
somewhat oppose	2.8
strongly oppose	4.3
TOTAL	100.0

Table Thirteen	
The Transportation Master Plan Update suggests that to ensure our transportation system is sustainable and to preserve the character of our community, traffic in Boulder should remain at current levels. Do you feel this goal is appropriate for our community?	**Percent of Respondents** $_{N=2080}$
yes	54.4
no (no reason specified, or other reason)	16.8
no, should be lower	23.4
no, should be higher	5.4
TOTAL	100.0

Table Fourteen	
To keep traffic at current levels, the Transportation Master Plan Update proposes the following actions: **- Establish priorities for transportation spending** **- Invest in - and encourage - all types of transportation** **- Manage the rate, location and quality of growth** **- Manage land use to reduce dependence on automobiles** **Reduce the demand for single occupant car travel by offering more incentives to use alternative transportation and eliminating incentives for driving** **- Form partnerships regionally and locally** **Do you support or oppose these actions?**	**Percent of Respondents** $_{N=2110}$
strongly support	55.3
somewhat support	27.3
neither support nor oppose	4.8
somewhat oppose	5.2
strongly oppose	7.5
TOTAL	100.0

Table Fifteen	
The cost of our transportation needs exceeds available funds. the Transportation Master Plan update proposes the following spending priorities: **1) Maintain our existing transportation system and increase safety.** **2) Decrease the impact of the automobile in our neighborhoods by creating noise walls and reducing through traffic.** **3) Increase roadway efficiency such as reducing congestion at intersections by widening left turn lanes.** **4) Increase transportation system capacity by adding through travel lanes on roadways, increasing mass transit services and completing our pedestrian and bicycle system.** **Do you support or oppose these spending priorities?**	**Percent of Respondents** $_{N=2063}$
strongly support	40.5
somewhat support	35.4
neither favor nor oppose	4.7
somewhat oppose	9.5
strongly oppose	9.9
TOTAL	100.0

Table Sixteen	
If in opposition (to Question 5), why?	**Percent of Respondents***
Oppose #1	4.0
Oppose #2	19.8
Oppose #3	6.2
Oppose #4	3.6
too much emphasis on bike access	14.2
don't like way prioritized	12.6
too much of a focus on cars	11.6
disapprove of noise / sound walls	9.8
increase / improve mass transit	1.2
speeder / traffic enforcement	0.8
oppose traffic circles	0.6
expand / complete bike and ped routes	0.4
expand / complete bike routes	0.4
light synchronization	0.4
disincentives for driving alone	0.4
increase fees associated with car operation	0.4
HOP-like transit / small buses	0.2
alternative modes in general / encourage	0.2
expand / complete ped routes	0.2
bike / ped improvements	0.2
affordable housing	0.2
reduce growth (unspecified)	0.2
improve access to services (eg businesses closer to home)	0.2
involve businesses in the process (eg funding, employee programs)	0.2
restrict CU student car use / possession	0.2

reduce incoming traffic	0.2
other	28.5

** Respondents could give more than one answer, so results sum to more than 100%.*

Table Seventeen	
Given these spending priorities, and the fact that there is not enough revenue to fund all these priorities, how willing would you be to pay to make up the difference?	**Percent of Respondents** $_{N=2099}$
very willing	25.2
somewhat willing	41.2
somewhat unwilling	15.2
very unwilling	18.4
TOTAL	100.0

Table Eighteen	
The Transportation Master Plan Update proposes that half of the trips currently made in single occupancy vehicles be made by other modes, or not taken at all, in order to keep traffic at today's levels. How likely is it that in 25 years (assuming options are in place such as a greatly improved transit system and completed bicycle and pedestrian systems) you could cut your single occupancy automobile use in half?	**Percent of Respondents** $_{N=2110}$
very likely	37.3
somewhat likely	23.4
somewhat unlikely**	11.8
very unlikely	23.5
don't know	4.1
TOTAL	100.0

*** NOTE: There was a typographical error on the survey form, and this option was actually labeled "somewhat likely". Most people who checked this option had changed the wording to **un**likely. However, these results may not be reliable due to this error.*

Table Nineteen	
Given that implementation of the Transportation Master Plan Update would require significant behavioral change and additional financial contribution, how achievable is the plan?	**Percent of Respondents** $_{N=2094}$
very achievable	13.4
somewhat achievable	45.9
slightly achievable	24.8
not at all achievable	15.9
TOTAL	100.0

Table Twenty

In the near term (2 to 4 years), what specific actions should the community take to meet its transportation goals?	Percent of Respondents *N=2245	In the near term (2 to 4 years), what specific actions should the community take to meet its transportation goals? (continued)	Percent of Respondents *N=2245
No answer given	20.1	PLANNING IMPROVEMENTS / URBAN DESIGN	3.8
INCREASE / IMPROVE MASS TRANSIT	17.1	affordable housing	0.9
HOP-like transit / small buses	15.7	reduce population growth	2.1
regional buses	1.5	reduce commercial growth	1.8
regional light rail	6.2	reduce growth (unspecified)	3.6
better / more convenient bus stops / routes	8.3	improve access to services (eg businesses closer to homes)	3.0
expanded bus pass / eco-pass / cheaper fares	4.7	involve businesses in the process (eg funding, employee programs)	2.7
alternative modes in general / encourage	2.3	flex time / telecommuting / compressed work	0.9
too much emphasis on mass transit / anti-bus	0.5	route traffic out of neighborhoods	1.4
IMPROVE ROADS / CAR ACCESS	6.8	ban cars / car free zones or times	1.5
improve traffic flow	7.9	DISINCENTIVES	6.9
light synchronization	6.1	increase parking fees	3.8
Foothills pkwy -- overpasses / interchanges	2.4	increase fees associated with car operation	4.7
HOV lanes	0.5	restrict CU student car use / possession	2.2
better / more flexible parking	3.4	speeder / traffic enforcement	4.9
carpooling / vanpooling	2.3	GENERAL	1.2
favor traffic circles	0.7	education programs	6.1
oppose traffic circles	2.5	taking personal responsibility	1.2
express lanes	0.4	reduce incoming traffic	1.6
BIKE / PED IMPROVEMENTS	6.9	INCENTIVES	5.3
expand / complete bike routes	7.4		
expand / complete ped routes	1.4		
expand / complete bike and ped routes	2.7		
too much emphasis on bike access	0.9		
too much emphasis on ped access	0.3		
bike enforcement	0.7		

** Some categories were quite broad, and more specific ideas were related to these bigger categories. The broadest categories are in capital letters in this table. These categories are used for comments that did not fit some of the more*

specific categories. The percents for the broader categories do NOT include comments given in the related categories; this is just a useful way to organize the comments. Respondents could give more than one answer, so results sum to more than 100%.

While the open ended comments of question 9 have been coded into the general categories shown in Table Twenty, these comments will also be reviewed by Transportation staff for themes and creative transportation ideas.